NOVITATES ZOOLOGICAE.

Vol. XVIII. JUNE, 1911. No. 1.

ON SOME NECESSARY ALTERATIONS IN THE NOMENCLATURE OF BIRDS.

PART II.

Continued from Nov. Zool. xvii. p. 503 (1910).

By GREGORY M. MATHEWS.

THE succeeding notes refer, as in the previous part, almost entirely to Australian birds, but those dealing with generic names in some cases will appeal to students not interested in that fauna. I wish to acknowledge the invaluable aid given by Mr. C. Davies Sherborn in the matter of obtaining dates; indeed, without his assistance some of these notes would not have been written. At the end of the Australian notes I have added a few which deal entirely with extra-Australian birds, but contain points which seem necessary to be recorded.

Since the publication of my conclusions regarding the invalidity of the Brissonian genera I have received the "Opinions rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature." Opinion No. 20 seems to have a direct bearing on the matter of Brisson, and the acceptance of the Summary there arrived at would necessitate the recognition of the genera proposed by Brisson. The printed Discussion, however, contains points which require reconsideration.

Of Gronov's species it is written, "Essentially, Gronow's specific designations are polynominal and diagnostic," and then the conclusion reads, "It is clear that Gronow's nomenclature is binary—that is, he names two units or things, genera and species." I would agree with Hoyle that "Gronow has not applied the principles of binary nomenclature."

Article 2 states: "The scientific designation of animals is uninominal for subgenera and all higher groups, *binominal for species*, and trinominal for subspecies." Inasmuch as Gronov failed to comply with this article, which is certainly a vital principle, he did not apply the principles of binary nomenclature, and hence, according to Article 25, his names are invalid. That this reasoning is valid cannot be denied, as Article 2 is not split into sections but reads consecutively, and must be accepted or rejected as a whole, not *partim*. Otherwise it might be claimed that the Gronovian specific names, which are by chance binominal, should receive recognition; indeed, this principle has been carried out with regard to some, not consistently binomial, writers.

But my main, and to me unanswerable, argument against Brisson was that he was non-binomial. I interpreted the word "binary" as equivalent to "binomial," and used the latter as more familiar to my readers. According to the reading of the Commission "binary" has an altogether different meaning. I am inclined to question the correctness of the Commission's ruling in this matter, and herewith

give my reasons. From the British Association Code of 1842 until the International Code the word "binomial" was used. In that Code the word "binary" was substituted, apparently on account of the use of trinomials. It has been accepted as corresponding absolutely to binomial by all the leading writers on nomenclature in every branch of science. As the meaning of "binary nomenclature" the standard dictionaries give "binomial nomenclature," and of "binary name," "binomial name."

That such was the intention of the compilers of the International Code is clearly shown by the wording of Article 26, which reads:

"Art. 26.—The tenth edition of Linné's *Systema Naturae*, 1758, is the work which inaugurated the consistent general application of the binary nomenclature in zoology. The year 1758, therefore, is accepted as the starting-point of zoological nomenclature, and of the Law of Priority."

There can be no doubt from the wording of this Article that only a substitute name for binomial was proposed. Linné's 10th Edition of the *Systema Naturae*, 1758, *did* inaugurate consistent *binomial* nomenclature, but it certainly cannot be stated to have introduced consistently "binary" as understood by the Commission's nomenclature. That was adopted by Linné in his 1st Edition, 1735, and from that date he was always "binary" until 1758, when he became "binomial" throughout in his writings.

I therefore submit that the meaning given to the word "binary" must be governed by the context, and that in view of Article 26 it can have none other than that used by me, *i.e.* absolutely equivalent to binomial.

Page 8: Genus XII. *Ptilopus* is preoccupied by Schönherr, *Isis* p. 1140 (1823).
„ 12: „ XXX. *Rallina* must be reinstated.

In the last number of the *Nov. Zool.* p. 493 I proposed the rejection of *Rallina* (auct.), not Reichenbach, and the substitution of *Euryzona* Bonaparte.

While the matter was in the press I came across a note by Witmer Stone (*Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philad.* p. 141, 1894) which, although Stone had arrived at the same conclusion as myself, provided data which led me to reconsider the question.

It appears that Stejneger (*Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus.* x. p. 395, 1887) over twenty years ago had anticipated me in advising the misuse (apparent) of *Rallina* and the necessity of using *Euryzona*. His arguments led to a different source of *Rallina*, and consequent invalidity of the conclusions of Stejneger, Witmer Stone, and myself.

Stejneger (p. 396) wrote:—

1846. *Corethrura* Gray, *Gen. B.* iii. p. 595 (type *R. ceylonicus* Gm.) nec Reichb.
1855. *Rallina* Gray, *Cat. Gen.* p. 120 (type *R. fasciatus* Raffl.) nec Reichb.
Unfortunately he did not say what he considered *Corethrura* Reichb. or *Rallina* Reichb. to refer to.

Witmer Stone, probably basing his researches upon this groundwork, gave more detail, thus:—

On p. 132—

1848. *Rallina* Reich. *Syn. Av.* vol. iii. Rasores—type *R. maximus* Vieill.;

and on p. 141—

1846. *Rallina* Gray, *Gen. Birds* iii. p. 595—type *R. zeylanicus* Gm. (nec *Rallina* Reichb.).

Through an apparent oversight he then rejected Gray's name, though obviously it had priority.

Moreover, on p. 134 he had stated that Reichenbach **first** proposed the name *Rallina* in his *Synopsis Avium* vol. iii. Rasores, fam. *Rallinae*, which agrees with his quotation on p. 132.

Reference to Gray's *Genera Birds* iii. settled the matter, for on p. 595 Gray introduced "*Corethrura* Reich.," naming thirty-one species but designating no type. A footnote reads: "Established by M. Reichenbach in 184 ? *Rallina* of the same author is synonymous."

The second species, however, is thus treated :—

"2. *C. fasciata* (Raffl.), *Linn. Trans.* xiii. p. 328; *Gallinula euryzona* Temm., Pl. col. 417; *Rallus ruficeps* Cuv.—type of *Rallina* Reich. 1845."

This was dated November 1846. Hence we have definitely :—

Rallina (Reich.) Gray 1846—type *R. fasciata* Raffl., as *R. ruficeps* Cuv. = *R. fasciata* Raffl.

All quotations as to *Rallina* and its type are somewhat after this style (*Cat. Birds* xxiii. p. 74) :—

Rallina Reichenb. *Handb. Fulicar.* p. xxi. (1846).

This reference is apparently incorrect as to the date, but I cannot get to the truth regarding Reichenbach's works. According to Meyer in his *Index zu L. Reichenbach's Ornith. Werken*, published in 1879, the date of the publication of the family *Rallinae* was December 30, 1846, and of the synopsis *Natatores*, etc. 1848. If these be accurate then *Rallina* must be quoted as of Gray's introduction. Even if *Rallina* was published prior to Gray's use, no type was designated anterior to Gray's selection.

The type selections, both for *Corethrura* and *Rallina*, given by Stejneger and Witmer Stone, are inaccurate, the type of *Corethrura* Reichenbach having been fixed by Reichenbach himself in the *Nat. Syst. Vögel* p. xxiii. 1852 as *jardinii* A. Smith, which is one of the species originally included by Gray.

Page 14 : Species 68. *Aptenodytes patagonica* Miller, *Var. Subj. Nat. Hist.* pt. iv. pl. 23 (1778)
replaces *A. forsteri* Gray.

The latter species has not yet been recorded from Australia, whereas the former has recently been noted from Tasmania.

When I reviewed the nomenclature of the Penguins (*Noc. Zool.* vol. xvii. p. 495, 1910) I indicated the existence of the Millerian plates but questioned their publication. While the paper was in the press I noted their quotation by Boddaert, and since then I have seen that Richmond has dated the entrance of *Aptenodytes* from Miller 1778 (*Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus.* vol. xxxv. p. 590, 1908), and that Riley (*Auk*, p. 269, 1908) has given details of these Millerian plates. Their recognition will give stability to the genus *Aptenodytes* as generally accepted. Therefore *Aptenodytes* will date from Miller (1778), and the type (by monotypy) *Aptenodytes patagonica* Miller.*

* It is worthy of remark that these plates of Penguins (for others were issued later) seem to be the ones from which the illustrations were made that appear in Forster's paper. The original drawings of Geo. Forster in the British Museum show that they were the source of both J. R. Forster's and Miller's plates. They have, in Geo. Forster's handwriting, "Published by J. F. Miller," and also reference to J. R. Forster's paper in Comment. Gotting.

Page 16 : Species 84. *Puffinus brevicaudus* Gould
replaces *P. tenuirostris* Temminck.

„ 21 : Species 126. *Sterna striata* Gmelin, *Syst. Nat.* XIIIth Ed. p. 609 (1789)
replaces *Sterna frontalis* Gray.

This is a change that should have been made long ago, and I now find that Sharpe (*Hist. Coll. B. M.* vol. ii. p. 204, 1906), from a study of Ellis's drawings, has already pointed out its necessity.

Page 21 : Genus LXXII. *Megalopterus* Boie, *Isis* p. 980 (1826)
replaces *Micranous* Saunders.

In the *Isis* p. 980 (1826) Bois introduced his new genus thus :—
Megalopterus tenuirostris Tem. col. 202, n.s.w.

Saunders in the *Cat. Birds* xxv. p. 136, 1896, placed this genus in the synonymy of *Anous*, stating *Megalopterus* Boie, *Isis* p. 980, 1826, cf. id. *op. cit.* 1844, pp. 187–8—type *A. stolidus* ; and in the synonymy of *A. stolidus* (p. 137) gave *Megalopterus tenuirostris* Boie, *Isis* p. 980, 1826 (nec Temm., cf. Boie, *Isis* pp. 187–8, 1844).

But in the *Isis* (1844), at the quotation made, Boie only referred his *Megalopterus* to the synonymy of *Anous* (Leach) Steph. (1825), on the score of priority, using both genera with their wide significations. Boie also identified *tenuirostris* Tem., Pl. col. 202, with *St. senex* Leach. That action had no effect either upon the generic status of *Megalopterus* nor the specific of *tenuirostris* Tem., Pl. col. 202. If Temminck's species were valid, and if ever generically separable, no other course was open save the adoption of Boie's name. This was made absolute by Gray, who, in his *List Genera Birds* p. 79, 1840, included *Megalopterus* Boie (type) *M. tenuirostris* Temminck, Pl. col. 202. Yet in the *Bull. B. O. C.* No. xxiii. p. xix, 1895, Saunders proposed a new genus *Micranous* for *Sterna tenuirostris* Temminck. In the *Cat. Birds* Saunders retained his own genus, dealing with *Megalopterus* Boie as stated above, and as the introduction of *tenuirostris* gave Pl. col. 202.

Page 23 : Genus LXXXI. *Lobibyx* Heine, *Nomencl. Mus. Hein.* p. 334, 1890
replaces *Lobivanellus* nec Strickland.

Strickland, in *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.* p. 32, 1841, proposed *Sarciophorus* for three birds, the first-named being *pileatus* Gmelin. On p. 33 he introduced *Lobivanellus*, to which he referred nine species, the first of which was *goensis* Gmelin. The same year Gray in his 2nd Edition of his *List Genera Birds* included these two genera (p. 84), and designated as types the first-named species in each case.

In his *Nat. Syst. Vögel* p. xviii, 1852, Reichenbach made a new disposition thus :—

Lobivanellus.	Type *L. lobatus* Latham.
Sarciophorus.	„ *S. pectoralis* ; and proposed
Sarcogrammus.	„ *S. goensis* Gmelin.

Of course these designations are invalid owing to the prior action of Gray, but in the *Cat. Birds* xxiv. Reichenbach has been followed with regard to *Lobivanellus* and *Sarcogrammus*, though the error was noted when dealing with *Sarciophorus*. Consequently *Lobibyx* of Heine must be used for *Lobivanellus* of the *Cat. Birds*, and *Lobivanellus* will be the name of the genus there called *Sarcogrammus*.

Page 23 : Species 147. *Lobibyx novaehollandiae* Stephens, in Shaw's *Gen. Zool.* vol. xi. pt. ii. p. 516 (1819)
replaces *L. lobatus* " Latham " Vieill.

Latham proposed the name *Tringa lobata* in the *Suppl. Index Ornith.* p. lxv, 1801, for this bird, but that combination had been utilised by Linné in the *Syst. Nat.* Xth Ed. p. 148 (1758) for another species. Vieillot's *Vanellus lobatus* (*Nouv. Dict. et Hist. Nat.* vol. xxxv. p. 209, 1819) is simply a new generic location for Latham's species, so that we have to fall back upon Stephens's name as above.

Page 24 : Genus LXXXIV. *Plurialis* Schaeffer, *Mus. Ornith.* p. 48 (1789)—type *P. aurea—Charadrus plurialis* Linné
replaces *Charadrius* nec Linné.

„ „ Genus LXXXV. *Eupoda* Brandt, in Tchihatcheff's *Voy. Sci. Altai Oriental* p. 444 (1845)—type (by monotypy) *E. caspia* Pallas
replaces *Ochthodromus* Reichb. 1852.

„ „ Genus LXXXVI. *Charadrius* Linné, *Syst. Nat.* Xth Ed. p. 150 (1758)—type *C. hiaticula*
replaces *Aegialitis* Boie, 1822.

„ 26 : Genus XCV. *Tringa* Linné, *Syst. Nat.* Xth Ed. p. 148 (1758)—type *T. ocrophus*
replaces *Helodromas* Kaup (1829).

„ „ Genus XCVI. *Heteroscelus* Baird, *Rep. Expl. Surv. Railr. Pac. Ocean* vol. ix. p. 734 (1858)
replaces *Heteractitis* Stejneger, 1884.

Refer to note under Genus CXLVIII, *Oxyura* (p. 9).

Page 27 : Genus XCVIII. *Xenus* Kaup, *Skizz. Entwick. Gesch. Nat. Syst.* p. 115 (1829)
replaces *Terekia* Bonaparte, 1838.

The same remark applies as to the preceding.

Page 28 : Genus CVI. *Canutus* Brehm, *Vögel Deutschl.* p. 653 (1831)—type *C. canutus* L.
replaces *Tringa* nec Linné.

In *Nov. Zool.* vol. xvii. p. 502, 1910, I pointed out that under existing laws *Curvirostra* Scopoli should replace *Loxia* as currently accepted. In a footnote Dr. Hartert drew my attention to the fact that by the exercise of tautonymy *Loxia* could be preserved. Privately he referred me to the published Opinions of the International Commission on Nomenclature, where Opinion No. 16 dealt with tautonymy as applicable to the Linnean genera. That Opinion, while ruling that it was a most desirable proceeding to have the type of the Linnean genera fixed by this method when available, carefully decided to say nothing with regard to the only debatable cases, and wrote : " If any author attempts to construe the cases (viz. *Tringa*, *Charadrius*) under the present ruling, the burden of proof to show that he is justified in the procedure rests upon him." I consider this a most unscientific proceeding, and feel that if the Linnean genera can lawfully have types fixed by this method (viz. tautonymy), **all** that will admit of such type fixation must be so treated. Consequently I accept as type of

Charadrius Linné, Xth Ed. p. 150, 1758, *Charadrius hiaticula* Linné, and, as type of *Tringa* Linné, Xth Ed. p. 148, 1758, *Tringa ocrophus* Linné.

I do **not** feel it necessary, the sentence of Commission Opinion No. 16 above quoted notwithstanding, to give proof of the urgency of the alterations, but nevertheless will place on record a few of the vicissitudes of *Tringa*.

When Bechstein (*Ornith. Taschenb. Deutch.* ii. p. 282, 1803) introduced *Totanus* he included in it species of *Limosa*, and in *Tringa*, p. 302, he included both *ocrophus* and *canutus*. In *Vanellus*, p. 312, he included *vanellus* and *squatarola*.

Illiger in the *Prodromus*, p. 262, 1811, proposed *Aetitis* for a mixture of *Limosa*, *Totanus*, etc., and used *Tringa*, p. 263, for *vanellus* and *squatarola*. In the *Abhandl. K. P. Wissen.*, 1812–13, p. 230, 1816, he accepted *Tringa* for what he had called *Aetitis*, and referred his prior acceptation of *Tringa* to *Charadrius*.

Temminck (*Manuel d'Ornith.* p. xxxi, 1815) preserved *Tringa* for the "Tringoid" species and Totanus for "*ochropus*," etc., using *Vanellus* for *squatarola* and *vanellus*.

Koch (*Syst. baier. Zool.* p. xli, 1816) accepted the same disposition of the species as Temminck.

Vieillot (*Analyse nouv. Ornith.* p. 56, 1816) indicated as members of *Tringa*—*Maubeche-Alouette de Mer-Paon de Mer Buff.*

Cuvier (*Règne Animal* i. p. 467, 1817) restricted *Tringa* to *squatarola* and *vanellus*, designating the latter as *Tringa* s. str.; then joined the remaining members of Linné's *Tringa* and *Scopolax*, and subdivided them into various sections. For *canutus* he provided *Calidris*.

Forster (*Syn. Cat. Brit. Birds* p. 24, 1817) included *canutus* in *Tringa*, but put *ocropus* into *Totanus*.

Stephens, in Shaw's *Gen. Zool.* vol. xii. pt. i. p. 89, 1824, used *Calidris* for *canutus*, not designating anything as typical of *Tringa*, p. 115, but using it as a name for the residuum after allotting the species he was familiar with to various genera.

Boie (*Isis* p. 560, 1822) followed Temminck, whilst Brehm (*Vögel Deutschl.* p. 653, 1831) proposed *Canutus* for *canutus*, and *Tringa*, p. 650, he restricted to *maritima*, a Gmelin-Linnean species.

Fleming (*Phil. Zool.* ii. pp. 255–6, 1822) followed Cuvier, as did Lesson (*Manuel Ornith.* 1828) and Kaup (*Skizz. Entw. Geseh. Nat. Syst.* 1829).

It would seem that it is quite a questionable matter as to the correct type of *Tringa*, and Gray's designation of 1840 (*List Gen. Birds* p. 69) is just as unsatisfactory. So that, accurately speaking, the acceptance of tautonymy to fix the type will settle a matter which cannot otherwise be considered as scientifically decided.

The case of *Charadrius* is not quite the same, as the members of the genus are very closely allied, and not much genus-splitting could be done. The introduction of *Plurialis* by Schaeffer has however been consistently neglected. Its type by tautonymy is *P. aurea* = *Charadrius pluvialis* Linné. This has been commonly accepted as the type of *Charadrius* Linné, but some other species must be selected. The wisest course in this dilemma is the adoption of tautonymy and the fixation of the type of Linné's *Charadrius* as *hiaticula*.

The division *Ochthodromus* must bear the prior name *Eupoda* of Brandt. Some authorities may wish to ignore this name on account of a prior *Eupodes*, but to such I would point out that *Ochthodromus* on the same grounds would

appear ineligible, as *Ochthedromus* was used previously [by Le Conte, *Ann. Lyc. Nat. Hist. New York* p. 453 (1848)] to Reichenbach's *Ochthodromus*.

Page 25: Genus LXXXVIII. *Hypsibates* Nitzsch. in Ersch. u. Gruber's *Encycl.* vol. xvi. p. 150 (1827)
replaces *Himantopus* Bonnaterre (preoccupied).

In the last number of *Nov. Zool.* p. 499 I allowed the use of *Himantopus* Bonnaterre. I unfortunately overlooked the fact that this name was preoccupied by Müller, *Anim. Infus.* p. 248 (1786), so that we have to fall back upon *Hypsibates*, which was provided on account of the invalidity of *Himantopus*.

Macrotarsus was introduced by Lacépède (*Tabl. Ois.* p. 18, 1799) for this genus, but it is unavailable from the fact that earlier in the *Tabl. Mamm.* p. 5, 1799, he had proposed the same name.

Page 28: Species 181. For this species *acuminata* Horsfield must be resumed.

Examination of the Watling drawing upon which the species *aurita* was founded, and which Sharpe (*Hist. Coll. B.M.* ii. p. 147) recognised as pertaining to the species commonly known as *acuminata* Horsfield proves it to be a good figure of Linné's *hypoleucos*.

Sharpe's determination seems to be purely a lapsus, as no reason for such identification appears in the figure.

Page 28: Species 184. *Canutus magnus* Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.* p. 39 (1848)
replaces *C. crassirostris* Temminck and Schlegel, *Fauna Japonica*, p. 107 (1849).

No proof of prior publication of *C. crassirostris* can be obtained.

Page 29: Genus CIX. **Irediparra** nom. nov.
replaces *Hydralector* auct. nec Wagler.

In the *Isis* p. 279, 1832, Wagler introduced a new genus *Metopidius* for "Latham's *Parra africana* and Cuvier's *Parra aenea*." On the next page he proposed *Hydralector* for "Vieillot's *Parra cristata*, *Nouv. Dict.* 16, p. 450, and Temminck's *Parra gallinacea* Pl. Col." In the *List Genera Birds* 1840 Gray typified these genera thus:

Page 70: *Hydralector* Wagl. — *H. cristatus* (Vieill.) Wagl.
„ 71: *Metopidius* Wagl. — *M. aeneus* (Cuv.) Wagl.

In the *Cat. Birds* xxiv. p. 73, 1896, these two species are synonymised with *Parra indica* Latham, which is considered the type of *Metopidius*. As a consequence *Hydralector* became an absolute synonym of *Metopidius*. But on p. 79 *Hydralector* is used, the type being given as *H. gallinaceus* Temm.

However, that action cannot be admitted, and as no other name is available I propose the above, with *I. gallinaceus* = *Parra gallinacea* Temm. as type.

Page 29: Species 189. *Trachelia maldivarum* Latham & Davies, *Faunula Indica* p. 11 (1795)
replaces *T. orientalis* Leach (1820).

In the *Faunula Indica* p. 11, 1795, Latham & Davies proposed three names, *G. maldivarum*, *G. coromanda*, and *G. madraspatana*, for the three varieties described by Latham in the *Gen. Syn. Birds* vol. v. p. 224. These have all

been referred to the synonymy of the species upon which Leach bestowed the name of *orientalis* twenty-five years later.

Page 29 : Species 190. *Burhinus magnirostris* Latham, *Suppl. Index Orn.* p. lxvi. (1801)
replaces *B. grallarius* Latham.

The name *magnirostris* was given on the same page as *grallarius*, but appeared first. It has been neglected owing to slight inaccuracies in the diagnosis. Both names, as well as a third, were given to birds represented by drawings. I have examined the drawings known as the Watling drawings, now in the British Museum, and find that the one upon which *magnirostris* was founded is by far the best representation of the bird. I therefore have no hesitation in adopting this name in preference to the two later ones, *grallarius* and *fraenatus*.

Page 30 : Genus CXIV. *Choriotis* (Bp.) Gray, *Cat. Gen. Subgen. Birds* p. 109 (1855)
replaces *Eupodotis* auct. nec Lesson.

Eupodotis was introduced by Lesson in the *Revue Zool.* ii. p. 47, 1839, for a number of species, *Otis rhaad*, *arabs*, and others. The following year Gray typified (*List Genera Birds* p. 64, 1840) *Eupodotis* by *rhaad* Gm. as of Lesson, *Mus. Senckenb.* ii. pl. 15.

In the *Ann. Sci. Nat.* Ser. iv. vol. i. *Zool.* p. 148, 1854, Bonaparte included *Choriotis*, a nude name. In the *Cat. Gen. Subgen. Birds*, p. 109, 1855, Gray noted :

Choriotis Pr. B. 1854. Type *Otis arabs* Linn.

The succeeding year Bonaparte used *Choriotis* (*Comptes Rendus* xliii. p. 416, 1856), attaching thereto *arabs*, *cristata*, *edwardsi*, and *australis*.

In the *Nat. Syst. Vögel* p. xxx, 1852, Reichenbach had typified *Eupodotis* Gray by *O. arabs*, and proposed *Trachelotis* with *caerulescens* as type.

In the *Cat. Birds* xxiii. 1894 is given :

Page 308 : *Trachelotis* Reichb. Type *T. caerulescens*.
„ 322 : *Eupodotis* Lesson. „ *E. arabs*.

As congeneric with *caerulescens* Vieill. is included *senegalensis* Vieill., as a synonym of which is accepted *rhaad* (*Mus. Senckenb.* ii. p. 230, taf. 15, 1837), and *rhaad* Gm. is dismissed as indeterminable. But Rüppell's fixation of *rhaad* would seem to decide its identity, and hence *Eupodotis* must be resumed for the species included in the *Cat. Birds* under *Trachelotis*, which becomes synonymous, and for the species typified by *arabs*, *Choriotis* must again, as formerly, be recognised.

Page 30 : Genus CXV. *Mathewsia* Iredale, *Bull. B. O. C.* vol. xxvii. p. 47 (1911)
replaces *Antigone* Reichb. (preoccupied).
„ 33 : Genus CXXXI. *Ardeiralla* Bonaparte, *Consp. Ac.* ii. p. 131 (1856)
replaces *Dupetor* Heine.

Dupetor was proposed (*Nomencl. Mus. Hein. Orn.* p. 308) as a substitute for *Ardeiralla*, the latter name not meeting with approval on account of its unclassical formation. I cannot generically separate the Australian bird from the type of *Ardeiralla*, but to those more skilled the generic name *Xanthocnus* Sharpe

(*Bull. B. O. C.* iii. p. xxxvii, 1894) introduced for the Austral-Malayan species will be available.

Page 35 : Species 222. *D. gouldi* Gould, *Handb. Birds Austr.* ii. p. 374 (1865)
replaces *D. arcuata* Horsfield.

In the *Cat. Birds*, vol. xxvii. p. 153 Salvadori preferred *D. arcuata* Horsfield, *Zool. Res. in Java*, pl. 65, 1824, for the Austro-Malayan species differentiated from *D. javanica* of the same author previously proposed in the *Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond.* vol. xiii. p. 199, 1822.

Salvadori accepted *arcuata* on the plate given, but the letterpress covered *javanica*. The facts are : Horsfield proposed *javanica* and noted varieties, one of which agrees with the bird in question now considered specifically separable. In his second paper he used *arcuata* for the same group on account of its prior introduction by Cuvier in MS. only, and sank *javanica* as a synonym of the later *arcuata*. Of course, in reality *arcuata* is a pure synonym of *javanica*, the latter having priority. Count Salvadori, however, recognising that the figure given really belonged to one of the varieties, used *arcuata* as based on that figure, though the text proved the contrary. This course is not permissible. As a substitute I have fallen back upon *gouldi*, which Gould accepted for the Australian bird as of Bonaparte. Bonaparte's introduction (*Comptes Rendus*, vol. xliii. p. 649, 1856) was of a nude name only, so that the above quotation is the first description.

Two other prior names have been used for this bird, but each I consider inapplicable. Müller's *Anas badia* (*Verh. Nat. Gesch. Land en Volkenk.*, p. 159, 1842) is another nude name, whilst Fraser's *A. vagans* was described from the Philippines (*Zool. Typica*, p. 68, 1849), and I am not inclined to accept it for the Australian form.

Page 36 : Genus CXLVIII. *Oxyura* Bonaparte, *Ann. Lyc. Nat. Hist. New York*, ii. p. 390, 1828
replaces *Erismatura* Bonaparte, 1831.

I am unable to find that *Oxyura* is preoccupied. I have noticed several prior usages of *Oxyurus*, but none of *Oxyura*. Under the existing nomenclatorial laws the latter must be used. I may state that I have carefully considered this matter, as the American Ornithological Union have sanctioned the rejection of some names ending in *-us* on account of prior similar names ending in *-a* and *vice versa*, but in other cases accepted some differing only in the same way, and conclude that confusion would ensue should the American Ornithological Union's views be adopted. Many changes would be necessary in the nomenclature of Australian birds by following the American Ornithological Union Code. To those who would wish to retain *Erismatura* I would point out that it would occupy an unstable position. As far as I can trace, though that generic name, *Giorn. Arcad.* lii. p. 208, is usually quoted as 1831, it was not published until well on in the year 1832, whereas *Cerconectes* Wagler, *Isis*, 1832, p. 282, appeared early in that year and appears to have priority.

Page 38 : Species 244. *Sula dactylatra* Lesson, *Traité d. Ornith.* p. 601 (1831)
replaces *S. cyanops* Sundevall, 1837.

In the *Cat. Birds*, vol. xxvi. p. 430 Ogilvie-Grant accepted *cyanops* of Sundevall (*Physiogr. Sallsk. Tidsk.* (Lund.) i. p. 218, 1837) in preference to

Lesson's *dactylatra*, which first appeared in the *Voy. Coquille* i. p. 494, noting, "The description of *S. dactylatra* given by Lesson is unrecognisable." This remark may be applicable to the note given in the *Voy. Coquille*, but certainly not to the account in the *Traité*, which fixes the species as the bird called *cyanops* by Sundevall six years later. It appears probable that the Australian bird will bear the name given to it by Gould, viz. *personata*, but I have not yet sufficient material to decide.

Page 39 : Species 254. *Circus approximans* Peale, *United States Expl. Exped.* p. 64 (1848)
replaces *Circus gouldi* Bonaparte, 1850.

„ 40 : Genus CLXI. *Hieraaëtus* Kaup, *Classif. Säug. & Vög.* p. 120 (1844)
replaces *Eutolmaetus* Blyth, 1845.

„ 41 : Species 266. *Haliastur leucosternus* Gould, *Synops. Birds Austr.* pt. iii. April 1838
replaces *H. girrenera* Vieillot.

Vieillot (*Galérie d'Ois.* i. pl. x. 1820) proposed *Haliaetus girrenera* simply as a new name for the bird described as *Falco pondecerianus* Gmelin. He wrote : "On le trouve aussi, selon Latham, à la Nouvelle Hollande, où il porte le nom que nous lui avons conservé." Of course this cannot be construed as separating the Australian from the Indian bird, especially when the context is read. Consequently we must revert to Gould's name founded on the Australian species.

Page 44 : Species 293. *Ninox queenslandica* Mathews, *Bull. B. O. C.* xxvii. p. 62 (1911)
replaces *Ninox humeralis*, Bonaparte.

The later bird is confined to New Guinea, and is represented in Queensland by a distinct form, as above.

Page 45 : Genus CLXXVIII. **Eutelipsitta** nom. nov.
replaces *Psitteuteles* nec Bonaparte.

„ „ Genus CLXXIX. *Psitteuteles* Bonaparte
replaces *Ptilosclera* (Bp.) Gould.

In the *Rev. Mag. Zool.* vol. vi. p. 157, 1854, Bonaparte introduced *Psitteuteles* with four species—*versicolor* Vig., *iris* Temm., *euteles* Temm., and *placens* Temm. No type was indicated, and therefore the following year Gray (*Cat. Gen. Subgen. Birds*, p. 88) selected the first named as type.

In the *Handb. Birds Austr.* ii. p. 98, 1865, Gould used *Ptilosclera* as of Bonaparte for *versicolor* alone. He referred to *Ptilosclera versicolor*, *Comptes Rendus*, 1857, but gave no pagination. In the *Cat. Birds B. M.* vol. xx. p. 66 *Ptilosclera* is accepted for the species *versicolor*.

Its entry is given as that of Bonaparte, *Comptes Rendus*, vol. xliv. p. 597, 1857, but at that place only the nude name occurs, no indication being given as to its extent. The earliest systematic use of the name I have traced is that of Gould, as above.

In the *Cat. Birds* xx. p. 63 *Psitteuteles* is also retained, the type being selected as *P. euteles* Temminck. But Gray's designation invalidated all later type differentiations, and consequently *Ptilosclera* must be replaced by *Psitteuteles*, and a new name is necessary for the group erroneously known by the latter name.

I therefore propose *Eutelipsitta*, and designate as type *Psittacus chlorolepidotus* Kuhl.

Page 46 : Species 311. *Cyclopsitta leadbeateri* McCoy, *Annals Mag. Nat. Hist.* Ser. iv. vol. xvi. p. 54, July 1, 1875
replaces *C. maccoyi* Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.* p. 314, Aug. 1, 1875.

„ „ Genus CLXXXII. *Solenoglossus* Ranzani, *Elem. di Zool.* iii. pt. ii. p. 18, pl. v. figs. 2, 3, 1821
replaces *Microglossus* Vieillot..

Salvadori's reason for rejecting *Solenoglossus*, as given in the *Cat. Birds* xx. p. 102 footnote, reads :

"*Solenoglossus* Ranz. has certainly the priority over *Microglossus* Geoffr., but it conveys quite a false idea of the structure of the tongue."

Then follows a history of the name *Microglossus*.

It is interesting to note that Gray, in the *List Genera Birds*, p. 69 (1841), used *Microglossum* Geoffr., 1809 ; probably following Gray, Agassiz, in the *Nomen. Zool. Aves*, p. 47, 1846, gave *Microglossum* Geoff., *Ann. Mus.* xiii. (1809).

But search through the *Annales Mus. d'Hist. Nat. Paris*, vol. xiii. (1809) does not reveal *Microglossum*, though in that volume Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire introduced a new genus *Microdactylus*. I surmise that the similarity of names, through inadvertence, caused the reference of *Microglossum* to this place. I have looked through all Saint-Hilaire's papers without result, and when he later discussed *Microglossus* Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire did not claim to have previously proposed the name, and accepted it as of Vieillot, *Galérie d'Oiseaux* i. p. 47, pl. 50.

In the same place Count Salvadori pointed out that *Proboscíger* Kuhl (*Consp. Psitt.* p. 12, 1820) was not proposed generically, but only the name given to a section, and therefore did not recognise it as applicable from that introduction. With this statement I quite agree, and refuse to accept names simply proposed sectionally as of their sectional date.

But I noted that on p. 170 Count Salvadori has allowed the use of *Conurus*, which was proposed at the same time and in the same manner as *Proboscíger*, and moreover dates it from the *Consp. Psitt.* of Kuhl. I consider it invalid as of that place, and before it was taken up generically *Aratinga* would appear to have been proposed by Spix (*Av. Bras.* i. p. 29, 1824). Further, the earliest use of *Conurus* I can trace is that of Lesson, who, in the *Manuel d'Orn.* ii. p. 148, 1828, used it subgenerically and cited as type *Psittacus rufirostris* L. enl. 550. This is one of Kuhl's original species, and therefore should *Conurus* be recognised as of Kuhl, it follows that its type would of necessity be that species. In the *Cat. Birds* xx. p. 443, the species, enl. 550, is called *Palaeornis torquata* Boddaert, the name given to that figure alone. It would thus follow that *Conurus* Lesson, 1828, should be quoted in the synonymy of *Palaeornis*. To refer it incorrectly to Kuhl, 1820, would mean the displacement of *Palaeornis* by *Conurus*. Consistently *Conurus* must be displaced by *Aratinga*.

Further, Count Salvadori (*Cat. Birds* xx. p. 138) rejected *Micropsitta* Lesson, *Traité d'Orn.* p. 646. 1831, in favour of *Nasiterna* Wagler, *Mon. Psitt.* p. 498. 1832. No reason is given, but in the *Ibis*, 1906, p. 326, Count Salvadori has explained, " The latter name (*Micropsitta*) was proposed as a subgenus of *Psittacus*, and not as a real genus." Here Count Salvadori is clearly at fault, as for nomen-

clatorial purposes names proposed generically and subgenerically are of equal value; therefore *Nasiterna* must be replaced by *Micropsitta*.

Page 47 : Genus CLXXXV. *Cacatoës* Dumeril, *Zool. Analytique* p. 50 (1806)
replaces *Cacatua* Vieillot.

„ „ Genus CLXXXVII. *Leptolophus* Swainson, *Zool. Illustr.* IInd Ser. pl. 112 (1832–3)
replaces *Calopsitta* Lesson, *Illustr. Zool.* pl. xlix. 1835.

In the *Cat. Birds* xx. p. 135, *Calopsitta* is preferred as of date May 1832; the month of Swainson's genus not being given.

A casual examination of Lesson's work showed that Mai 1832 was only the date of the text to pls. xlix. and l., and had nothing to do with publication.

The text to pls. xlv. and xlvi. is dated Juillet 1833.

Upon reference to the Bibliothèque Française I obtained the following dates.

The prospectus, noticed February 4, 1832, gave the information that the volume would consist of 20 livrs., each livraison to contain 3 pls. with text, not paged, and the first No. to be issued March 1, and thence monthly.

The dates show that this was not carried out :

1ère	livr.	3	plates.	In 8° de	$\frac{3}{4}$	sheet.	July 14, 1832.
2e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{1}{2}$	„	Sept. 1, 1832.
3e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{3}{4}$	„	Oct. 13, 1832.
4e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{3}{4}$	„	Nov. 3, 1832.
5e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{5}{8}$	„	Dec. 1, 1832.
6e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{3}{8}$	„	Feb. 23, 1833.
7e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{1}{2}$	„	April 13, 1833.
8e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{1}{2}$	„	Aug. 10, 1833.
9e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{5}{8}$	„	Aug. 24, 1833.
10e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{3}{4}$	„	Oct. 19, 1833.
11e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{1}{2}$	„	Dec. 21, 1833.
12e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{5}{8}$	„	March 22, 1834.
13e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{1}{2}$	„	May 17, 1834.
14e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{3}{4}$	„	Aug. 2, 1834.
15e	„	3	„	„	$\frac{3}{4}$	„	Jan. 17, 1835.

No further notices appear in this jonrnal, but in the *Comptes Rendus*, December 1835, p. 517, livr. 18 and 20 are noticed.

As corroboratory evidence it may be noted that the text to pl. lx. contains a reference to *Journal de l'Institut*, No. 72, 27 Septembre, 1834.

These dates, therefore, place the publication of *Calopsitta* in 1835.

The 1st Series of Swainson's *Zool. Illustr.* were published monthly, and the 2nd Series was commenced on the same plan. They were announced on February 29, 1829, to appear monthly. In the *Mag. Nat. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 272, June 1831, Swainson himself wrote, "In each regular number (12 out of 13) there are five plates," and in the same volume, p. 555, wrote in a letter dated September 1831, "The 17th and 18th came out but a month ago." He there threatened to publish only two more parts. Apparently this was done, and constitutes the first two volumes. Then under pressure a third volume was undertaken some time later, and it was completed early in 1833, the preface being dated March 4, 1833. I have been so far unable to fix the absolute date of the parts comprising this last volume, but there can be no doubt that the date given on the title-page, 1832–3, is correct.

Consequently the date for *Leptolophus* Swainson, at the latest, is 1833, and it has thus clear priority over *Calopsitta*.

It may be as well to note that Wagler, in the *Abhandl. Ak Wissensch. München*, i. p. 490, proposed *Nymphicus*, and included thereunder two species, *bisetis* and *novaehollandiae*. This paper is dated 1832, and as I have shown above was published about that date. In the *List Genera Birds*, p. 51, 1840, Gray typifies this genus by *novaehollandiae*, and it would seem that another conflicting element was to be introduced. Reference to Wagler's paper, however, shows that the genus was based on *bisetis*; *novaehollandiae* being included from literature only, Wagler carefully noting, "Non vidi." Under these circumstances I would admit the abrogation of Gray's type designation and the retention of *Nymphicus* for the *bisetis* group.

While noting these Parrakeet names it is of interest to point out that *Dasyptilus* of Wagler (*loc. cit.* p. 502) is retained in the *Cat. Birds* xx. p. 385, in preference to *Psittrichas* Lesson, while when Wagler introduced his genus he pointed out that he had been anticipated in publication by Lesson with *Psittrichas*, and it is this note that gives us some idea of the date of publication of Wagler's paper.

As a synonym of *Psittacus pecquetii* Less., *Bull. des Sci. Nat.* xxv. p. 241, Juin 1831, Salvadori quotes *Banksianus fulgidus* Lesson, *Traité d'Orn.* p. 181, 1831 (type examined).

I have shown that this part of the *Traité d'Orn.* was published in 1830; hence a double change is necessary, and the bird called *Dasyptilus pecquetii* Lesson must bear the name *Psittrichas fulgidus* Lesson.

Page 47: Species 327. *L. auricomis* Swainson, *Zool. Illus.* IInd Ser. pl. 112 (1832–3)
replaces *L. novaehollandiae* Gmelin, *Syst. Nat.* XIIIth Ed. 1788. p. 328, not p. 316.

„ 48: Species 328. *P. swainsonii* Desmarest, *Dict. Sc. Nat.* xxxix. p. 39 (1826)
replaces *P. barrabandi* Swainson, 1821 (nec Kuhl, 1820).

„ „ Genus CXC. *Aprosmictus* Gould, *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.*, 1842, p. 111
replaces *Ptistes* Gould, *Handbook Birds Austr.* ii. p. 37, 1865.

„ „ Genus CXCI. *Alisterus* nom. nov.
replaces *Aprosmictus* Gould, 1865, not 1842.

When Gould introduced his genus *Aprosmictus* he stated "Types *Platycercus scapulatus* and *erythropterus*." When Gray, in the *Cat. Gen. Birds*, 1855, designated types he selected the latter, and of course against this there can be no objection. However, in 1865 Gould proposed a new name for the *erythropterus* group, and restricted *Aprosmictus* to the *scapulatus* group. This misuse of the names was carefully noted by Gray in the *Handl. Gen. Sp. Birds B. M.* 1870, who, as sections of *Platycercus*, gave

p. 138: *g. Aprosmictus* Gould, 1842.
Synonym *Ptistes* Gould, 1865.
p. 139: *h.* —— ?
Synonym *Aprosmictus* Gould, 1865.

Yet, in the *Cat. Birds*, vol. xx., apparently following Gould, Salvadori retained

p. 481: *Ptistes.* Type *P. erythropterus.*
p. 485: *Aprosmictus.* „ *A. cyanopygius.*

As Gray's action settled the matter, there is no other course open save the

introduction of a new name for the group erroneously known by the generic name of *Aprosmictus* and the use of *Aprosmictus* for the genus hitherto known as *Ptistes*.

The type of *Alisterus* is *A. cyanopygius* = *Psittacus cyanopygius* Vieillot.

Page 49 : Species 338. *Platycercus caledonicus* Gmelin, *Syst. Nat.* i. p. 328 (1788)
replaces *P. flaviventris* Temm. (*P. browni* Kuhl).

„ „ Species 344. *P.* **cecilae** nom. nov.
replaces *P. splendidus* Gould, 1845 ; nec Shaw, 1792.

„ 50 : Species 360. *Psephotus* **dulciei** nom. nov.
replaces *P. multicolor* Kuhl, *Mon. Psitt.* p. 55 (1820), not Gmelin, *Syst. Nat.* p. 328 (1788).

„ 51 : Genus CXCVIII. *Lathamus* Lesson, *Traité d'Orn.* p. 205 (1830)
replaces *Euphema* Wagler, 1832.

Oberholser, in the *Smithson. Miscell. Coll.* vol. xlviii. p. 61, 1905, discussed the names proposed for this genus, and accepted *Euphema* Wagler, and in my *Handlist* I adopted his conclusion. Recently I have had occasion to go into the matter more closely than at the time when I prepared my *Handlist*, and I find Oberholser's decision must be reversed.

The first name to be introduced was *Nanodes*, by Vigors & Horsfield in the *Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond.* vol. xv. p. 274, who designated as type *Psittacus discolor* Shaw. Oberholser, accepting the date of this paper as 1827, rejected *Nanodes* on account of the prior *Nanodes* Schönherr, *Curc. Disp. Meth.* p. 322, 1826. But the part of the Linnean Transactions containing *Nanodes* was issued in 1826, so that an awkward position would have resulted had it not been that Schönherr had previously published *Nanodes* in the *Isis*, p. 587, 1825 ; so that, though Mr. Oberholser's dates were incorrect, *Nanodes* is nevertheless invalid.

In the *Traité d'Orn.* p. 205, Lesson proposed *Lathamus* as a substitute for *Nanodes* (preoccupied). Oberholser rejected this name, as he contended that *Lathamus* had been used in the *Centurie Zool.* p. 63. pl. 18 in conjunction with a bird which was not congeneric with *discolor* Shaw, and that this usage appeared anterior to the *Traité* introduction. Oberholser used as dates those on the title pages of the two publications, namely, 1831 for the *Traité*, and 1830 for the *Cent. Zool.* But the latter was obviously incorrect, as articles in the *Cent. Zool.* bore dates ranging from 1822 to March 1831.

Moreover in the *Journ. autour Globe du "Thetis,"* ii. p. 313, 1837, Lesson stated he had introduced new names for the divisions of Parrots in the *Traité* published in 1830. I therefore endeavoured to fix the dates of issue of the *Traité* and *Cent. Zool.* so that the priority of *Lathamus* in *Traité* or *Cent. Zool.* should be settled. As it is probable that these dates will have a bearing upon other matters as well as the one at issue I herewith give my results.

The Bibliothèque Française gives as dates of receipt of the parts of the *Traité d'Orn.* as follows :

1ère livr.	No plates.	In 8° de 5 sheets,	pp. 1–80.	Feb. 13, 1830.
2e „	15 plates and 15 plates.	5 „	pp. 81–160.	May 8, 1830.
3e „	15 „	In 8° de 5 „	pp. 161–240.	July 10, 1830.
4e „	15 „	„ 5 „	pp. 241–320.	Sept. 25, 1830.
5e „	—	—	pp. 321–400.	—
6e „	—	—	pp. 401–480.	About March 1, 1831.
7e „	15 plates.	In 8° de 5 sheets,	pp. 481–560.	April 9, 1831.
8e „	15 „	„ 5 „	pp. 561–end.	June 11, 1831.

The pagination is estimated, parts as issued not being available to me.

This would give as date of publication of *Lathamus* of the *Traité d'Orn.* July 10, 1830.

From the same source I obtained information regarding the *Centurie de Zool.*, thus :

1ère livr.	No plates.	In 8° de 2 sheets; in 4° de 4 sheets.	March 20, 1830.
2e „	5 „	„ 2 „	Oct. 2, 1830.
3e „	5 „	„ 1 sheet	Jan. 29, 1831.
4e and 5e livr.	—	—	—
6e, 7e, and 8e livr.	15 plates.	Un seul cahier de 3 sheets.	July 9, 1831.
9e to 12e livr.	—	—	—
13e to 16e „	20 plates.	Un seul cahier de 3¼ sheets.	May 19, 1832.

" Le cahier annoncé aujourd'hui est le dernier " is added to this notice.

From this it is conclusive that *Lathamus* of the *Cent. Zool.* could not have have appeared until after the *Traité* usage.

A complication at first sight appears by the notices of the *Cent. Zool.* given in Ferussac's *Bull. des Sci. Nat.* In vol. xix. p. 321, No. 186, November—December 1829, a notice is given of its appearance, and twelve plates are indicated as forming livr. 1 and 2. In vol. xxiii, p. 261, No. 153, November 1830, another notice is given of livr. 1—5, and here the contents of livr. 3—5 are given as 5 pls. each, and *P.* (*Lathamus*) *aurifrons* is mentioned as part of livr. 3. In vol. xxiv. p. 351, No. 222, March 1831, livr. 6—12 are noticed.

That all these notices are preliminary is proved by the receipt of the parts as given by the Bibliothèque Française. The first appeared without plates, and the second with five only instead of the twelve noted above in the first notice. The second instance appears similarly as preliminary note with regard to livr. 3—5, as there *P.* (*Lathamus*) *aurifrons* is given as part of livr. 3, which contained five plates only, and this, with the twelve noted, only makes seventeen, whereas *P.* (*L.*) *aurifrons* is plate 18.

Examination of the dated articles in the *Cent. Zool.* shows that the majority of the first twelve bear dates October—November 1829, pointing out that the first notice was written probably from MS. The text to plate 74 is dated March 1831, whilst the Postscriptum at the end of the work is dated February 1831. Consequently no reliance can be placed upon these dates or the notices in the *Bulletin*, and the only trustworthy dates are those given in the Bibliothèque Française.

As Lesson was one of the reviewers attached to the *Bulletin*, it is easy to see how such preliminary notices could be written.

The name selected by Oberholser, namely *Euphema* Wagler, appeared in the *Abhandl. Ak Wissensch.* München, i. p. 492, and the date accepted by Oberholser, 1832, may be admitted. This paper has sometimes been quoted as 1829–30, but a footnote on p. 502 quotes the *Bullet. Unic.* 1831, p. 241. This appeared in June 1831, so that at the earliest it was later than that date.

Oberholser, when admitting *Lathamus* of the *Cent. Zool.*, wrote that its connection with the species there figured " makes it a synonym of *Bolborhynchus*." Of course this was purely an error, as that name was not introduced until almost thirty years after the issue of the *Cent. Zool.*

Page 57 : Species 405. *Cuculus pallidus* Latham, *Ind. Orn. Suppl.* p. lx (1801)
replaces *C. inornatus* Vig. & Horsf.

Dr. Hartert, in the *Nov. Zool.* xii. p. 217, 1905, first cast doubt upon the traditional identification of Latham's Pale Pigeon with the Cuckoo. From an examination of the Watling drawings, from which Latham drew up his descriptions, Sharpe (*Hist. Coll. B. M.* vol. ii. p. 145, 1906) tentatively referred the type drawing of Latham's Pale Pigeon to *Lopholaimus antarcticus* Shaw. Such an extraordinary identification led me to examine the Watling drawings, which are preserved in the British Museum, and I find the drawing to be unmistakably of the Cuckoo, and hence Latham's name must be reinstated. The points of inaccuracy raised by Dr. Hartert are visible on the drawing, but it is quite a good representation of the Cuckoo, and however Sharpe wrote his note comparing it with *L. antarcticus* I cannot understand, save that it was purely a *lapsus calami*.

Page 57 : Species 406. *Cacomantis rubricatus* Latham, *Ind. Orn. Suppl.* p. lv (1801)
replaces *C. rufulus* Vieill.

„ „ Species 407. *Cacomantis variolosus* Horsfield, *Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond.* vol. xv. p. 300 (1826)
replaces *C. flabelliformis* nec Latham.

The nomenclature of these Cuckoos has been the subject of some discussion. North, in the *Ibis*, p. 53, 1906, has, from an examination of the descriptions, reversed the traditional identifications, preferring *rufulus* Viellot, *Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. Nat.* vol. viii. p. 234, 1817, for the species previously known as *flabelliformis* Latham, and using *flabelliformis* Latham for the species known as *variolosus* Horsfield. Sharpe, in the *Hist. Coll. B. M.* ii. p. 121, 1906, recognised the Watling drawing upon which *flabelliformis* was founded as applicable to that species as commonly understood, though he pointed out many inaccuracies. This figure was reproduced in the General Synopsis, and it is obviously not applicable to any Australian Cuckoo : the black band on its throat prevents its adoption for any species, and I therefore reject *flabelliformis* as indeterminable, and probably extra-Australian. When examining the Watling drawings I recognised that some of them, such as this, are obviously not representations of Australian birds, however untrustworthy they might be. I do not consider any of the drawings untrustworthy, as the great majority are recognisable at sight, whilst most are really good figures.

The Watling drawing No. 202, upon which is founded the *Sylvia rubricata* Latham, *Ind. Orn. Suppl.* p. lv, 1801, is a splendid representation of the bird previously known as *flabelliformis* Latham, and was so recognised by Sharpe (p. 142) when dealing with the Watling drawings. Consequently it is available for this species, and we can resume *variolosus* Horsfield for the species previously known under that name, but which appeared in my *Handlist* as *flabelliformis*.

It may not be out of place to note that in the Watling drawings, Nos. 202 and 203 are both named Ruddy Warbler, the latter named as female. This latter was correctly identified by Sharpe as *Eopsaltria australis*.

The description of the Ruddy Warbler in the *Gen. Syn. Suppl.* ii. p. 249 is based upon both figures, but the description in the *Ind. Orn. Suppl.* p. lv, upon which the name *rubricata* stands, applies solely to the Cuckoo.

Latham's description is inaccurate only in the colour of the feet, which are given as "flavi," and which the figure shows dark.

Page 59 : Genus CCXXIII. *Menura* Latham, *Suppl. Index Orn.* p. lxi (1801).
replaces *Menura* Davies (1802).

„ „ Species 418. *M. n. hollandiae* Latham, *Suppl. Index Orn.* p. lxi (1801).
replaces *M. superba* Davies (1802).

In the *Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond.* vol. vi. p. 207 Davies described *Menura superba.* The date of this introduction has been usually given as 1800, and it has been preferred to *Menura n. hollandiae* Latham, *Suppl. Index Orn.* p. lxi, 1801. But though Davies's note was read in 1800, an additional note (p. 210) is dated June 19, 1801, and, as a matter of fact, it was not published until 1802, as Mr. Sherborn has already pointed out (*Index Animalium*, p. 607, 1902). Consequently Latham's names have absolute priority, and must be accepted.

Page 68 : Species 504. *Coracina melanops* Lath. must be resumed for this species.

Sharpe, in the *Hist. Coll. B. M.* ii. p. 113, when explaining the Watling drawings, pointed out that *Lanius robustus* seemed to be the first name given to the bird commonly known as *Graucalus melanops* Lath., and upon this authority, in my *Handlist*, I included species No. 504, *Coracina robusta* Lath. = *C. melanops* Lath.

Re-examination of the Watling drawings having indicated errors of identification on the part of Sharpe with regard to some species, which are noted in this paper, I carefully went into the matter again. With the birds in front of me I find that *robustus* is not applicable, whereas No. 58, the type of *Corvus melanops*, is a splendid representation. We are therefore compelled to resume *melanops*, as it undoubtedly should never have been changed. The type figure of *robustus* shows that Latham's description (*Gen. Syn. Suppl.* ii. p. 74) is correct—"the head and the whole of the neck as far as the breast are black . . . the tail in colour like the body, crossed near the end with a broad bar of black, but the very end of it is nearly white." These characters at once divorce the name *robustus* from connection with *melanops.*

Page 70 : Species 526. *Psophodes olivaceus* Latham, *Suppl. Ind. Orn.* p. xxvi (1801)
replaces *P. crepitans* Latham, *Suppl. Ind. Orn.* p. li, 1801.

This alteration will minimise the risk of such an erroneous localisation as that in the *Zool. Record*, 1909, Aves, p. 103, when, through the similarity of both the generic and specific names to *Psophia crepitans* Linné, this species is referred to the Order Gruiformes !

Page 74 : Species 557. *Origma solitaria* Lewin, *Birds of New Holland*, Pl. XVI (1808)
replaces *O. rubricata* nec Latham.

This change is necessary through the examination of the Watling drawings, when it is discovered that *Sylvia rubricata* Latham referred to the bird previously known as *Cacomantis flabelliformis.*

Page 75 : Species 564. In the *Nov. Zool.* vol. xvii. p. 501 (1910) I proposed the new name *Acanthiza archibaldi.*

This unfortunately appeared without any indication of its novelty ; hence this note is necessary in order to prevent confusion.

Page 80: Genus CCLXXIII. *Diaphorillas* Oberholser, *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philad.* p. 212 (1899)
replaces *Amytornis* Stejneger.

In the *Handl. Birds Brit. Mus.* vol. iv. p. 246 (1903) *Amytornis* (Stejneger, *Stand. Nat. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 499, 1885) is used as the genus name for the genus *Amytis* Lesson (preoccupied). However, at that quotation *Amytornis* is virtually a nude name, and, as far as I can trace, its first systematic use is in the *Handlist* as above (1903). But Oberholser had previously correctly proposed *Diaphorillas* for the same genus, and consequently that name must be used.

Page 82: Species 646. *Grallina cyanoleuca* Latham, *Suppl. Ind. Orn.* p. xxv (1801)
replaces *G. picata* Latham.

The Watling drawing, the type of *cyanoleuca*, is a good representation of the bird previously known as *picata*.

Page 84: Species 658. *Cracticus torquatus* Latham, *Suppl. Index Orn.* p. xviii (1801)
replaces *C. destructor* Temminck.

From an examination of Watling drawing No. 27 I made the above identification, and upon referring to *Hist. Coll. Brit. Mus.* ii. p. 113 (1906) I found that Sharpe had obtained the same result; but by writing "*L. torquatus* becomes a synonym of *C. destructor*" I had overlooked that the former name had almost twenty years' priority.

Page 89: Species 705. *Climacteris leucophaea* Latham, *Suppl. Ind. Orn.* p. xxxvi (1801)
replaces *C. scandens* Temminck.

Examination of the Watling drawings confirms this change, pointed out by Sharpe (*Hist. Coll. Brit. Mus.* ii. p. 134).

Page 90: Genus CCLXXXIX. The authority for *Dicaeum* is Cuvier.

Dicaeum is usually quoted as of Cuvier, *Règne Animal*, i. p. 410, 1817: a reference to Vieillot, *Nouv. Dict. et Hist. Nat.* vol. ix. p. 407, 1817, caused me to look up the dates of these two works.

From the Bibliothèque Française I gained the following dates of receipt:

La Règne Animal, 4 vols. in octavo, each 130 sheets plus 15 pls., Dec. 7, 1816.

Regarding the *Nouv. Dict.* I obtained:

Prospectus noticed	March 9, 1816.
Amended prospectus noticed . . .	July 20, 1816.
Vols. I., II., III. „ . . .	Sept. 14, 1816.
„ IV., V., VI. „ . . .	Dec. 14, 1816.
„ VII., VIII., IX. „ . . .	March 15, 1817.
„ X., XI., XII. „ . . .	June 21, 1817.
„ XIII., XIV., XV. noticed . . .	Sept. 13, 1817.
„ XVI., XVII., XVIII. „ . . .	Dec. 27, 1817.
„ XIX., XX., XXI. „ . . .	May 30, 1818.
„ XXII., XXIII., XXIV. noticed .	Sept. 5, 1818.
„ XXV., XXVI., XXVII. „ .	Dec. 26, 1818.

This date regarding Cuvier is of much interest, as it has always been known that it must have been published very early in 1817, so that the fact of its issue at the end of 1816 is noteworthy.

Page 90 : Species 725. *Pardalotus striatus* Gmelin, *Syst. Nat.* i. p. 1003 (1789)
replaces *P. affinis* Gould.

„ 91 : Species 733. *Melithreptus lunatus* Shaw, in Vieillot, Ois. Dor. vol. ii. p. 122, pl. 61 (1802)
replaces *M. atricapillus* nec Latham.

„ 92 : Species 741. *Melithreptus atricapillus* Latham, *Suppl. Ind. Orn.* p. xxxvii (1801)
replaces *M. brevirostris* Vigors & Horsf.

In the *Ibis*, p. 55, 1906, North advocated the adoption of Latham's *atricapillus* for the bird known as "*lunulatus*" Shaw. He, however, observed that the distinguishing character of the latter species was not mentioned.

Sharpe (*Hist. Coll. Brit. Mus.* ii. p. 128, 1906), from a study of the Watling drawings, independently proposed the rejection of "*lunulatus*" Shaw, and also preferred *atricapillus* for the species previously known under the former name. The absence of the name-character in the description made me dubious as to the correctness of identifying "*lunulatus*" and *atricapillus*. I therefore have carefully studied the Watling figures, and find that the above alterations are necessary. The figure upon which *atricapillus* was founded is quite a good pictnre of the bird known as *brevirostris* Vig. & Horsf. It mnst be remembered that Latham's descriptions were drawn up from these figures only, and consequently the colour values given by Latham depend entirely upon the artists. In the present instance the figure shows a dark head, which Latham concluded was black ; bnt upon comparing specimens of *brevirostris* and *lunatus* (for such is the name Shaw nsed) it was seen that the coloration of the figure agreed very well indeed with that of *brevirostris*, whereas it disagreed in many particulars with *lunatus*, which moreover was thrice well figured in the same set of drawings, Nos. 129, 130, and 131 (cf. *Hist. Coll. Brit. Mus.* ii. p. 132).

Page 94 Genus ccxcvii.

Grantiella nom. nov. replaces *Entomophila* Gould preoccupied by Horsfield, Zool. Res. Java 1824.

Page 96 : Species 786. *Ptilotis noraehollandiae* Latham, *Index Orn.* ii. p. 478 (1790)
replaces *P. ornata* Gould.

Through misreading the description, Gadow (*Cat. Birds* ix. p. 242) referred *noraehollandiae* to *auricomis* Latham.

Page 98 : Species 801. *Meliornis nigra* Bechstein, *Kurze Uebers.* p. 196. pl. 37 (1811)
replaces *M. sericea* Gould.

„ 100 : Species 821. *Motacilla flava simillima* Hartert, *Vög. Paläarkt. Fauna*, iii. p. 289 (1905)
replaces *M. barnardi* North, *Proc. Linn. Soc. New South Wales* xxx. p. 579 (1906).

Page 102: Genus CCCXX. *Stizoptera* Oberholser, *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philad.* p. 215 (1899)
replaces *Stictoptera* Reichenbach, preoccupied by Guenée, *Hist. Nat. Insect. Lépid.* vii. p. 51 (1852).

„ 105: Genus CCCXXXI. *Calornis* is preoccupied, as Mr. Oberholser has pointed out (*Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philad.* p. 215, 1899), and he has proposed to use as substitute *Lamprocorax* Bonaparte. In this he has been followed in the *Handlist Birds Brit. Mus.* v. p. 529, but I cannot see that there are characters to generically separate this group from *Aplonis* Gould, and I propose to use that generic name for species 856.

„ 107: Species 874. *Corvus* **marianae** nom. nov.
replaces *C. australis* Gould (not *C. australis* Gmelin, *Syst. Nat.* p. 377, 1788, nor Bechstein, Latham's *Vögel*, iv. p. 725, 1793).

There are no characters of generic value to separate the species of *Corone* Kaup from species of *Corvus* Linné, and consequently the three Australian species are all referable to the latter genus.

The following note regarding the nomenclature of the Wheatears and Chats seems to be of sufficient importance to be recorded.

Saxicola Bechstein, *Ornith. Taschenb.* i. p. 216 (1802)—type (by subs. desig. Swainson, 1827),

S. rubicola = *Motacilla rubicola* Linné

must be used for the Chats; and

Oenanthe Vieillot, *Analyse* p. 43 (1816)—type (by tautonymy),

Oe. oenanthe = *Motacilla oenanthe* Linné

for the Wheatears.

In the *Ornith. Taschenb.* i. p. 216 (1802) Bechstein introduced *Saxicola*, and included therein *Motacilla oenanthe* L., *M. rubicola* Linné, and *M. rubetra* Linné. No type was designated, but his figured species was *Saxicola rubicola*.

Vieillot (*Analyse*, p. 43, 1816) proposed *Oenanthe*, and mentioned as species *Motteux* Buff. (= *Motacilla oenanthe* Linné) and *Turdus leucurus* Latham. These two are congeneric, and the type by tautonymy is *M. oenanthe* Linné. In the *Syst. baier. Zool.* p. xxxv, 1816, Koch included in *Saxicola* several species—viz. *Turdus saxatilis* Gm., *Mot. tithys* Linné, *Mot. phoenicurus* Linné, *Mot. succica* Linné, and *Mot. oenanthe* Linné, and then provided for *Mot. rubetra* Linné and *Mot. rubicola* Linné the new genus *Pratincola*.

Strictly speaking, Koch's action cannot be construed as simple subdivision of Bechstein's genus, and Vieillot's action in naming generically the Wheatears alone would leave the Chats to bear Bechstein's generic name of *Saxicola*. Thus actually by elimination we arrive at the results I have given above.

Forster (*Syn. Cat. Brit. Birds*, p. 15, 1817) also gave a generic name to the Wheatears, taking up *Vitiflora*, and including the Chats in *Curruca* with the Robins and others. At p. 54, however, he placed the Chats (*rubicola* and *rubetra*) alone in *Saxicola* and preferred *Oenanthe* for the Wheatear, while the same year Stephens (in Shaw's *Gen. Zool.* vol. x. pl. ii. p. 564) also accepted *Vitiflora* without including the Chats.

In the *Isis*, p. 552, 1822, Boie used *Saxicola* Bechst. for the two Linnean Chats and *Vitiflora* for the Wheatears.

In the *List Genera Birds*, p. 22, 1840, Gray used *Vitiflora* with type *V. oenanthe* L. for the Wheatears, and *Rubetra* with type *R. rubetra* L. for the Chats. In the 2nd Edition, p. 30 (1841), Gray used *Saxicola* Bechst., and designated as type *S. oenanthe* L. for the Wheatears, accepting *Frutiicicola* Macgillivray, with type *F. rubetra* L. for the Chats. At p. xi he pointed out that *Frutiicicola* must give way to *Pratincola* Koch.

It is this action which has apparently governed all later systematists, and I find that the type of *Saxicola* Bechst. is accepted in the *Amer. O. Union Checklist*, 3rd Ed. p. 365 (1910) as *M. oenanthe* L. by subsq. desig. Gray, 1841.

But even accepting the type by subsequent designation method, in preference to the more accurate one of elimination, the results I have given must be recognised; for Swainson, in the *Zool. Journ.* iii. p. 172 (1827), absolutely named as type of *Saxicola* Bechst. the species *Mot. rubecola* Linné, and nothing whatever can be urged against this action, save that *Pratincola* Koch had been proposed for the two species of Chats, and I would have allowed this claim in order to preserve the general acceptation of the names were it not that *Pratincola* is inacceptable on account of its prior use by Schrank (*Fauna Boica* i. p. 209, 1798).

Amandava Blyth, White's *Nat. Hist. Selborne*, p. 44, note (1836)
replaces *Sporaeginthus* Cabanis, *Mus. Hein.* i. p. 170, 1850.

Blyth writes: "*Amandava punctata* mihi *Fringilla amandava* Linné."

Sporaeginthus included two species, *subflava* Vieill. and *amandava* Linné, and though Gray in the *Cat. Gen. Subgen. Birds*, p. 76, 1855, designated the former as type, in the *Cat. Birds B. M.* vol. xiii. p. 319, 1890, *amandava* is given as type.

Vaginalis versus *Chionis*.

In *Nov. Zool.* xvii. p. 503, 1910, I pointed out that two new genera were proposed by Forster in the *Enchiridion*, 1788, and in the XIIIth Ed. *Systema Naturae* Gmelin also named the same two genera.

Arguing that the two works were of even date, I concluded that both of Gmelin's names should be preferred on account of his citation of species, inasmuch as Forster's genera stood upon diagnoses only. Previous to my note one of Forster's had been used and one rejected, but I had been unable to find any reason for such action.

My action in preferring Gmelin's names has now been questioned on the score of priority, the second part of Gmelin's *Systema Naturae* not having been published until 1789. I therefore endeavoured to settle the matter from that standpoint.

Hopkinson (*Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.* p. 1035, 1907) has worked out the dates of Gmelin as far as he could trace. His results are:

Part I. Earliest notice traced 25. vii. 88.
„ II. „ „ „ 20. iv. 89.
„ III. „ „ „ 20. xi. 89.

As in the *Index Animalium* Sherborn had dated both Parts I. and II. 1788, I referred to him for data. With his usual unfailing courtesy he referred me to the *Götting. Anzeig.*, and there I found the notice of Part II. in the April 20, 1789, number, p. 641, and I also found, what to me was more important, a notice of Forster's *Enchiridion* in the number for March 27, 1788, p. 489.

Thus, as the earliest date of Gmelin's Part I. yet traced, as above, is July 25, 1788, both Forster's names must be accepted on the grounds of absolute priority.

Consequently—

Chionis Forster, *Enchiridion* p. 37, 1788 (before March 27)
must be resumed instead of *Vaginalis* Gmelin, 1789 (before April 20),

but—

Callaeas Forster, *Enchiridion* p. 35, 1788 (earliest notice March 27)
will replace *Glaucopis* Gmelin, *Syst. Nat.* XIIIth Ed. Part I. p. 363, 1788 (earliest notice July 25).

I would like to point out that *Macrorhamphus* Forster (*Syn. Cat. Brit. Birds* p. 22, 1817) appears to be invalidated by the prior use of the same name by G. Fischer in the *Zoognosia* i. p. 91 (1813).

Limnodromus Neuwied (1833) seems to be the next name to use.

Gallirallus Lafresnaye, *Rev. Zool.* iv. p. 243 (1841), must be used for the Woodhens of New Zealand, the well-known *Ocydromus* having been used by Schellenberg (*Helvet. Entomol.* vol. ii. p. 16, 1806) twenty-four years prior to Wagler's use. (I have been asked to include this note by Mr. Tom Iredale.)

Micropsitta Lesson, *Traité d'Orn.* p. 646 (1831)
replaces *Nasiterna* Wagler, *Abhandl. Ak. Wissensch. München* i. p. 498 (1832).

Aratinga Spix, *Av. Bras.* i. p. 29 (1824)
replaces *Conurus* Kuhl, *Mon. Psitt.* p. 4, 1820 (not proposed generically).

The reasons for these changes I have given when dealing with *Solenoglossus* Ranzani.